



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/976,322	11/21/1997	KIMMO DJUPSJOBACKA	915-312	1733
4955 7590 03/12/2007 WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			EXAMINER BROWN, RUEBEN M	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS		MAIL DATE 03/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/976,322	Applicant(s) DJUPSJOBACKA ET AL.	
	Examiner Reuben M. Brown	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10, 12, 14 and 28-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10, 12, 14 and 28-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/11/06, with respect to the Admitted Prior Art have been fully considered but they are moot, since examiner does not rely on that section of Applicant's disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2-6 & 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa, (U.S. Pat # 6,147,714), in view of Wasilewski, (U.S. pat # 5,600,378).

Art Unit: 2623

Considering claim 2, the amended claimed method for 'addressing at least one service in a data communication system including at least one data transmission network for transmitting information in at least one data transmission stream', such that at least one service provider transmits services to at least one data transmission network', wherein the services are assigned service ID data is met by Terasawa, (col. 8, lines 40-50), which discusses a service ID that is provided as a label for a particular service within a transport stream (Fig. 13).

The amended claimed original transmission network, reads on the disclosed original network ID (original_network_id(2)), see col. 8, lines 32-33. Also Terasawa more generally discloses a parameter, the Service Provider Item, discussed in Terasawa, (Fig. 13). The Service Provider identifies the provider, i.e. the original network that provides the particular service, col. 7, lines 58-62.

The claimed broadcast service ID identifying a broadcast transmission stream from the broadcast service provider reads on Terasawa, (col. 8, lines 28-34), which discusses the broadcast transport stream ID. Terasawa (col. 8, lines 40-50) meets the claimed broadcast service ID identifying the service within the stream. Terasawa teaches that the SDT includes the data representing the services, such as service name, service provider, etc, (Fig. 13) which is associated with the identification information (Fig. 14).

'wherein on the basis of the identification data, the transmission stream and allocation therein is retrievable for use' is inherent in Terasawa.

As for the amended claimed feature of the non-numerical textual service identifier, Terasawa teaches that identification data uniquely identifies the broadcast services within the network, using the DVB definitions, and that for instance the DVB definitions may be used to identify EPG data (services); see col. 7, lines 55-67 thru col. 8, lines 1-3. The title of a program reads on the claimed non-numerical textual service identifier (service name).

The station name also reads on the claimed non-numerical textual service identifier (service provider name). For instance, Figs. 4 & 8 shows a plurality of different channels (service providers) that transmit a plurality of programs (services). Furthermore, Fig. 14 discusses that this data is transmitted as part of the SDT table, which is a construct that supports the claimed 'relation' between the identification data of a service and the instant non-numerical textual service identifier; also see col. 8, lines 26-67.

Regarding the further claimed feature of the 'changing the identification data and the relation, while maintaining the non-numerical textual service identifier and substantially maintaining the service, Terasawa does not discuss such a technique. Nevertheless Wasilewski, which is in the same field of endeavor of transmitting DVB defined video using DVB technology, (col. 2, lines 1-28) discloses maintaining services, even though the programs may be moved around to different transport streams, frequencies, etc. (col. 3, lines 22-67; col. 5, lines 25-55; col. 9, lines 1-60. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa to change the identification data of a service,

Art Unit: 2623

while still maintaining the non-numerical textual service identifier and substantially maintaining the service, for the improvement of a more flexible system, as taught by Wasilewski, col. 3, lines 5-19.

Considering claims 3 & 29, Terasawa (col. 4, lines 62-67 thru col. 5, lines 1-5 & col. 7, lines 55-60) discloses the use of DVB definitions for the data transmission protocol.

Considering claims 4 & 30, Terasawa teaches that the identification data is transmitted in the SDT tables, and that there is relation between the name information and the identification information, col. 7, lines 55-67 thru col. 8, lines 1-40.

Considering claims 5 & 31, the claimed use of the EIT table is met by the discussion of Terasawa, (Fig. 13; col. 7, lines 55-67 thru col. 8, lines 1-25) .

Considering claims 6 & 32 the subject matter reads on the transport stream_id disclosed in Terasawa, (Fig. 13 & col. 8, lines 25-30) & Wasilewski (col. 5, lines 56-65; col. 6, lines 24-30).

Considering claims 28, the claimed broadcasting device for transmitting at least one service, corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 2, and is likewise treated.

4. Claims 9-10, 12, 14 & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa & Wasilewski, further in view of Field, (U.S. Pat # 6,018,764).

Considering claim 9 & 35, even though Terasawa teaches the claimed non-numerical textual service identifier, the reference does not explicitly disclose that it may be used as part of a URL. However, Field (Abstract; col. 4, lines 1-25; col. 5, lines 4-60; col. 6, lines 15-55) teaches that the name information of a transmitted file (broadcast TV signal) may be part of a URL address. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa with the technique of the using the non-numerical textual service identifier as part of a URL, for the desirable advantage of a well known naming protocol that provides a logical access path to the service, as taught by Field, col. 3, lines 15-65; col. 5, lines 40-55; col. 6, lines 8-25. It is pointed out that Field is in the same field of endeavor as Terasawa, since it is directed to transmission by mapping a broadcast signal to a communication network (col. 8, lines 15-60). Thus the combination is proper.

Considering claim 10, the claimed data communications system comprising at least one transmission network for transmitting information on services, comprising elements that corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 2, are likewise rejected. The claimed "equipment for transmitting" reads on the transmission apparatus shown in Fig. 1 of Terasawa, col. 3, lines 21-65. The claimed feature of the broadcast service containing a

Art Unit: 2623

packet of service components reads on each packet representing a transmitted service as shown in Fig. 13 of Terasawa. As for the additionally claimed feature of the name information (i.e., service name) referring to a different identification data for obtaining the packet of service components, the claimed feature is broad enough to read on the system in Terasawa having multiple services transmitted, requiring multiple name information, so that each distinct name information refers to a different packet of service component, see col. 8, lines 25-60.

As for the further claimed feature of non-numerical descriptive worldwide globally individual name information, as discussed above in the rejection of claim 9, Field teaches the claimed subject matter. Field discloses mapping an HTML page into a TV broadcast signal by using URL technology, col. 6, lines 15-55.

Considering claims 12 and 14, the claimed broadcasting device and receiver comprises elements that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 10, and are likewise treated. Regarding the receiver, Terasawa discloses an IRD 2, see Fig. 20; col. 10, lines 59-67 thru col. 11, lines 1-22 & col. 12, lines 64-67 thru col. 13, lines 1- 8.

5. Claims 7-8 & 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa, in view of Wasilewski and further in view of Adams, (An Introduction to Digital

Art Unit: 2623

Storage Media-Command and Control, DSM-CC; IEEE Communications Magazine; November 1996)

Considering claims 7-8 & 33-34, Terasawa & Wasilewski do not using the DSM-CC object carousel or data carousel. Nevertheless, Adams discloses that the data carousel may be used for the periodic transfer of data messages to a client, page 10, section 8.1 It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa to utilize the data carousel technique at least for the known benefit of avoiding the necessity of two-way communication for the client to retrieve messages, as taught by Adams. Adams also discloses that the object carousel is beneficial for transmission of images.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Yamagishi Teaches transmitting EPG as DVB information.

B) Dozier Detecting change in a website and informing the user of such a change.

Art Unit: 2623

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown


REUBEN M. BROWN
PATENT EXAMINER